

DETAILED ACTION

- Examiner acknowledges receipt of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) received 5/2/2008.
- Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 17, and 18 are currently amended.
- Claim 21 has been cancelled.
- Claims 1-12, 14-15, 17-20, and 23-25 are currently pending.
- Examiner notes that claims 1 and 10 contain subject matter that is not supported by the specification. However, Examiner interviewed Applicant on 6/11/2008 to clarify the intended meaning of these limitations. The rejection below will use the intended claim meaning. Further, these claims have been objected to so that the Applicant can correct this claim language. This was done to speed prosecution by applying art to the intended claim meaning which is described in the Interview Summary and the bullets below.
- Claim 1 indicates "a demarcation device coupled to the first and second communication channels and interposed between the first and second communication channels and the one or more wired phones at the user location". This language is not supported in the specification. However, Applicant indicated that the intention was to indicate that the demarcation device is coupled to the first and second communication channels and is interposed between both (a) the first and second communication channels and (b) the first communication channel and the one or more wired phones at the user location. As indicated above, Examiner will give the claim language the above meaning in the forthcoming office action.

- In claim 10, the third step indicates that the incoming phone call is routed to "a wireless interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location". However, there is no support in the specification for this limitation. The specification has wireless interfaces for wireless phones and wired interfaces for wired phones. Applicant indicated that the limitation was likely intended to mean either the wireless interface(s) to the cordless phones and/or wireless SIP phones or the wired interfaces to the SIP phones and/or POTS phones. The forthcoming office action will use one of these interpretations and object to the claim language so that it is corrected in the next response.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/7/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see "Claim Objections" on page 8, filed 2/7/2008, with respect to the objection to claim 17 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection to claim 17 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments, see "Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102" on pages 9-11, filed 2/7/2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 19-25 under 35

Art Unit: 2619

U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0160780 to Mukerjee et al.

However, depending on the way claim 1 is amended regarding the objection to the new claim limitation, the previous rejection may still apply.

4. Applicant is silent with regards to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The applicable rejections to the amended claims are therefore maintained herein.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The specification is objected to as lacking support for the limitations of claims 15, 17-20, and 23-25 regarding a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for executing a computer-implementable method. The original disclosure supports this limitation in claim 15, but the specification must be amended (without adding new subject matter) to support this limitation.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims **1 and 10** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2619

- The phrase “wherein the receives an incoming phone call” in lines 11-12 of claim 1 should be corrected to “wherein the demarcation device receives an incoming phone call”.
- The phrase “should be routed to the one or more wired phones should be sent the incoming phone call” in lines 13-14 of claims 10 doesn’t make sense and should be corrected.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims **1, 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 15, 17-20, 23, and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0160780 to Mukerjee et al.

Regarding claim **1**, Mukerjee discloses a telephonic communication system for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the telephonic communication system comprising:

a first communication channel to a wireless phone (the wireless channel to phone 175 of Figure 2, for example), wherein incoming phone calls are directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (incoming calls are clearly routed to the wireless phone as indicated throughout Mukerjee; see the abstract for example);

a second communication channel to an interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (wired phone 150 of Figure 2, for example; the channel is the connection between the switch 140 and the network interface element 160 of Figure 2), wherein the first and second communication channels are accessible with a telephone number (see paragraphs 43 and 44 which indicates that both channels can be accessed using the subscribers published number which can be either the wired or wireless phone number); and

a demarcation device (the network interface device 160) coupled to the first and second communication channels (this coupling is clearly shown in Figure 2, for example) and interposed between the first communication channel and second communication channel (device 160 is interposed between the first and second channels as indicated in Figure 2) and the one or more wired phones (device 160 is also clearly interposed between the first channel and the wired phones as also indicated in Figure 2), wherein the receives an incoming phone call on the first communication channel directed to the telephone number for the wireless phone (see paragraph 44 on page 3 which describes an incoming call directed to the number of the mobile station (as indicated in paragraph 47, it is clear that mobile stations 170 and 175 are functionally interchangeable, but shown in different locations in the Figure), the demarcation device determines if the first and second communication channel channels should be simultaneously sent the incoming phone call directed to the telephone number (see paragraphs 43-45 on page 3;

Art Unit: 2619

“...after determining that the dialed MIN corresponds to a subscriber of the services...network interface 160...instructs mobile station 175 to ring...network interface offers/routes the call to switch 140 to ring wired station 150...wired station 150 and mobile station 175 ring concurrently...”.)

Regarding claim **10**, Mukerjee discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing an incoming phone call to a wireless phone (phone 175 of Figure 2, for example), the incoming phone call is directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (see paragraph 45 on page 3 which indicates that the call is routed to the wireless phone via the wireless phone’s number);

receiving the incoming phone call at a demarcation device having a wireless interface (the network interface device 160), the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the phone 150 in Figure 2 at user location), the demarcation device interposed between a PSTN and the one or more wired phones at the user location (the demarcation device (network interface device 160) is interposed between the PSTN and the wired phone 150 as indicated in Figures 2, 6, and paragraph 47 on page 3; Figure 2 indicates a connection to the PSTN (via the top output of interface switch 161); however, in Figure 2, it is not clear if PBX 140 is part of the PSTN or the user’s location; Figure 6 and paragraph 47 clearly indicate that in an embodiment, the PBX 140 may be a “private domain PBX” and that a call from the PSTN (via originating station 120) terminates at the network interface element 160; clearly in this embodiment, device 160 is interposed between the PSTN and the wired phones 150);

routing the incoming phone call to a wireless interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location, wherein the wireless phone and the one or more wired phones are accessible with a telephone number (as indicated in paragraphs 43-45 of page 3, incoming calls are routed concurrently to a wireless interface coupled to wireless phone 175 as well as to the one or more wired phone 150 at the user location; further, the wireless interface is coupled to the wired phones via interface switch 161 in Figure 2);

determining if the wireless phone should be sent an incoming phone call (see paragraph 43 on page 3 which describes the network interface 160 “determining if the dialed number corresponds to a subscriber of the services” and then concurrently rings the mobile station and the wired phone); and

determining if the incoming phone call should be routed to the one or more wired phones should be sent the incoming phone call (again, see paragraphs 43-45 which all indicate the network interface 160 determining if the number is for a subscriber to the services and then routes the call accordingly to the wired phone if appropriate); and

routing the incoming phone call to one or more of the wired phones (see the last 2 sentences of paragraph 43 on page 3, for example).

Regarding claim 17, Mukerjee discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for executing a computer-implemented method, the computer-implemented method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, (the method of Mukerjee is implemented using controller 165 of Figure 2 which as indicated in paragraph 28 on page 2 is programmed to determine how to route the calls; clearly, this indicates

Art Unit: 2619

a computer readable medium into which the instructions are “programmed”) the computer-implemented method comprising steps of:

routing an incoming phone call to a wireless phone (phone 175 of Figure 2, for example), the incoming phone call is directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (see paragraph 45 on page 3 which indicates that the call is routed to the wireless phone via the wireless phone’s number);

routing the incoming phone call to a demarcation device having a wireless interface (the network interface device 160), the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the phone 150 in Figure 2 at user location), the demarcation device interposed between the one or more wired phones and a phone call transport network (see Figure 2; clearly, the network interface device 160 is interposed between the wired phone 150 and the phone call transport network 130), wherein:

the wireless phone and the one or more wired phones are accessible with a telephone number (see paragraphs 43-45 on page 3 which indicate that the phones are accessible with a number), and

the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (as indicated throughout, the two routing steps occur concurrently or simultaneously; see paragraphs 43-45 on page 3, for example);

determining if the wireless phone should be sent the incoming phone call (see paragraph 43 on page 3 which describes the network interface 160 “determining if the dialed number corresponds to a subscriber of the services” and then concurrently rings the mobile station and the wired phone); and

determining if the one or more wired phones should be sent the incoming phone call (again, see paragraphs 43-45 which all indicate the network interface 160 determining if the number is for a subscriber to the services and then routes the call accordingly to the wired phone if appropriate).

Regarding claim **3**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the interface is located at the user location in Figure 2 and in paragraph 47 on page 3 (“...or a private domain PBX”).

Regarding claim **4**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the demarcation device provisionally sends the incoming phone call to the first and second communication channel until acceptance of the incoming phone call when one of the first and second communication channels receives the incoming phone call and the other of the first and second communication channel is disconnected from the incoming phone call (see the last sentence of paragraphs 43-45 as well as paragraph 61 which indicate that the incoming call is sent to both channels concurrently until one of them answers (paragraphs 43-45) and when one of them answers, the other is disconnected (paragraph 61)).

Regarding claim **6**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the interface is one of a wireless cellular interface, a PSTN interface and a VOIP interface in that the switch 140 is a PSTN like interface (although it resides in the user location).

Regarding claim **8**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the first communication channel uses different physical transport within the user location from the second communication channel (see Figure 2 which indicates that the two interfaces use different physical transport (wired to phone 150 and wireless to phone 175)).

Regarding claim **9**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones are chosen from the group consisting of a POTS phone, a cordless phone, a WIFI, SIP phone, and a wired SIP phone in that the wired phone 150 is a POTS phone.

Regarding claim **11**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (see the last line of paragraph 43 on page 3, for example).

Regarding claim **15**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 10 (the method of Mukerjee is implemented using controller 165 of Figure 2 which as indicated in paragraph 28 on page 2 is programmed to determine how to route the calls; clearly, this indicates a computer readable medium into which the instructions are “programmed”).

Regarding claim **18**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the demarcation device interface wirelessly couples the one or more wired phones to the phone call transport network (see Figure 2 which shows the wireless coupling from the network interface device 160 to phone 175 which couples the wired phone wirelessly to the call transport network).

Regarding claim **19**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (see paragraph 62 on pages 4-5 which indicates that if the wired phone answers first, the leg of the call to the mobile phone 170 or 175 is released).

Regarding claim **20**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that the second-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the wireless phone has been answered (see paragraph 61 on

Art Unit: 2619

page 4 which indicates that if the wireless phone 170 or 175 answers the call first, the wired leg is released).

Regarding claim **23**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that if the one or more wired phones have been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (see paragraph 62 on pages 4-5 which indicates that if the wired phone answers first, the leg of the call to the mobile phone 170 or 175 is released).

Regarding claim **24**, Mukerjee discloses the limitation that if the wireless phone has been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (see paragraph 61 on page 4 which indicates that if the wireless phone 170 or 175 answers the call first, the wired leg is released).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2619

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims **12, 14, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0160780 to Mukerjee et al in view of U.S. 6,816,582 to Levine et al.

Regarding claim **12**, Mukerjee discloses all limitations of parent claim 10 as indicated in the rejection above. Mukerjee further discloses the limitations of claim 12 of the first-listed determining step comprises a step of further comprising:

detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (see paragraph 62 on pages 4-5);

if the one or more wired phones has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (see paragraph 62 on pages 4-5);

if the one or more wired phones has not answered, detecting if the wireless phone has answered (see paragraph 61 on page 4);

if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (see paragraph 61 on page 4).

Similarly, regarding claims **14 and 25**, Mukerjee discloses all limitations of parent claims 10 and 17, respectively, as indicated in the rejection above.

Mukerjee also alludes to the use of a voicemail system in paragraph 38.

However, Mukerjee does not disclose expressly the limitation of claim 12 that if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system or the similar limitations of claims 14 and 25. This

Art Unit: 2619

is well known in the art. Consider Levine, for example which discloses the missing limitations of claims 12, 14, and 25 in lines 30-43 of column 8. Mukerjee and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of voice communications for contacting a user via multiple devices. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mukerjee to use a global voicemail system after a certain number of rings as taught by Levine. The motivation for doing so would have been to avoid continual ringing as suggested by Levine in lines 30-43 of column 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Mukerjee for the benefit of avoiding continual ringing to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12, 14, and 25.

12. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0160780 to Mukerjee et al in view of U.S. Patent 7,162,020 to Forte.

Regarding claim 2, Mukerjee discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as indicated in the rejection above. Mukerjee also discloses wireless cellular networks throughout. However, Mukerjee does not disclose expressly the limitation that the wireless phone and the wireless interface uses one of GSM, CDMA, AMPS, and TDMA transport. These technologies are well known in the art as common cellular interfaces/networks. Consider Forte, for example, which discloses this limitation in lines 22-25 of column 5. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mukerjee to use one of the above wireless interfaces explicitly. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the service to a wider number of potential subscribers by explicitly supporting these interfaces to

existing phones. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Mukerjee as suggested by Forte for the benefit of supporting a wider range of potential customers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

13. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0160780 to Mukerjee et al in view of U.S. Patent 2004/0170268 to Hakusui.

Regarding claim 5, Mukerjee discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Mukerjee does not disclose expressly the limitations of claim 5 that the second communication channel can join the incoming phone call of the first communication channel, and the phone call can be manually transferred from the second communication channel to the first communication channel. However, it is well known that call transfer and conferencing are features of PBX systems. For example, Hakusui discloses this in paragraph 3 on page 1. Mukerjee and Hakusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to *explicitly* include call transfer and conferencing in the features provided in the PBX of Mukerjee and thus extended to the remote device to disclose the limitations of claim 5. The motivation for doing so would have been to add the flexibility generally provided in PBX systems to the system of Mukerjee. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hakusui with Mukerjee for the benefit of providing PBX features to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 7, Mukerjee discloses the limitations of parent claim 6 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Mukerjee does not disclose expressly the limitations of claim 7 that the VOIP interface is one of a wireless Internet interface, a WIFI interface, a power line Internet interface, an ultra-wide band wireless interface, a microwave internet interface, a cable modem interface, and a direct broadcast satellite Internet interface.

Hakusui discloses a PBX like system which has a VOIP interface which is a cable modem interface. (The VOIP interface is the network interface 420 of Figure 2 and the limitation of the cable modem interface is indicated in paragraph 73 on page 5.) Mukerjee and Hakusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a VOIP interface to the network interface device of Mukerjee. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide access to VOIP service for customers to minimize or eliminate long distance phone charges as suggested in paragraph 4 on page 1 of Hakusui. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hakusui with Mukerjee for the benefit of minimizing long distance charges to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

14. Claims **1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-21, and 23-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,162,020 to Forte in view of U.S. Patent 6,816,582 to Levine et al.

Regarding claim **1**, Forte discloses a telephonic communication system for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the telephonic communication system comprising:

a first communication channel to a wireless phone (the link from the Wireless Connect 30 to the cellular phone 70 of Figures 1 and 3), wherein incoming phone calls are directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (the cellular telephone 70 of figure 1, for example);

a second communication channel to an interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the link from the Wireless Connect 30 to telephones 12a and 12b of Figures 1 and 3, for example);

a demarcation device (the combination of the PBX 14 and Wireless Connect 30 of Figures 1 and 3; as indicated in lines 37-47 of column 12, these can be combined into one device) coupled to the first and second communication channels and interposed between the first and second communication channels and between the first communication channel and the wired phone (see figure 1, which shows the demarcation device (elements 14 and 30, combined) between the two channels and the first channel (to the cellular phone) and the wired phones 12a and 12b), wherein the demarcation device receives an incoming phone call on a communication channel, the demarcation device determines if the other communication channel should be simultaneously sent the incoming phone call directed to the telephone number (see lines 46-49 of column 13).

Similarly, regarding claim **10**, Forte discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing an incoming phone call to a phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the phone with a telephone number (see lines 56-63 of column 6 which indicate the call directed to the wired device (12a) is directed to at least that phone);

receiving the incoming phone call at a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location, (the WC/PBX is the demarcation device and the incoming call is received there as described in lines 56-63 of column 6, for example), the demarcation device interposed between a PSTN and the one or more wired phones at the user location (see Figure 1 which shows the demarcation device (elements 14 and 30, combined) interposed between the PSTN 16 and the wired phones 12a and 12b);

determining if the incoming phone call should be routed to the one or more other phones (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example); and

routing the incoming phone call to one or more of the other phones (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example).

Similarly, regarding claim 17, Forte discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for executing a computer implemented method (the passage from line 66 of column 5 through line 10 of column 6 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software), the computer implemented method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing the incoming phone call to a phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the phone with a telephone number (see lines 56-63 of column 6 which indicate the call directed to the wired device (12a) is directed to at least that phone);

routing the incoming phone call to a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the WC/PBX is the demarcation device and the incoming call is received there as described in lines 56-63 of column 6, for example), the demarcation device interposed between the one or more wired phones and a phone call transport network (see Figure 1 which shows the demarcation device (elements 14 and 30, combined) interposed between the PSTN 16 and the wired phones 12a and 12b), wherein:

the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (see lines 46-49 of column 13, for example);

determining if the phone should be sent the incoming phone call (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example); and

determining if the one or more other phones should be sent the incoming phone call (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example).

Forte does not disclose expressly the limitations that the incoming call is directed towards a wireless phone and that the call is routed to one or more wired phones in addition to the targeted wireless phone. However, Levine discloses the limitation of an incoming call routed to a wireless phone number and then simultaneously ringing alternative wired devices throughout the document. See lines 3-5 of column 2 and lines 41-45 of column 2, for example. Forte and

Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to allow a wireless telephone to be the target of the incoming call. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user more flexibility by allowing the user's wireless (cellular) telephone to be the main number. This is suggested by Levine in lines 48-65 of column 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of improved user flexibility to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 10, and 17.

Regarding claim **2**, Forte discloses the limitation that the wireless phone and the wireless interface uses one of GSM, CDMA, AMPS, and TDMA transport (see lines 22-25 of column 5).

Regarding claim **3**, Forte discloses the limitation that the interface is located at the user location in that the WC and PBX are preferably co-located (see lines 51-55 of column 11) and the PBX is clearly at the user location (where phones 12a and 12b are located).

Regarding claim **4**, Forte discloses the limitation that the demarcation device provisionally sends the incoming phone call to the second communication channel until acceptance of the incoming phone call when one of the first and second communication channels receives the incoming phone call and the other of the first and second communication channel is disconnected from the incoming phone call (see steps 414-420 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim **8**, Forte discloses the limitation that the first communication channel uses different physical transport from the second communication channel (see figure 1 which clearly shows a different interface between WC and the PBX and wireless phone).

Regarding claim **9**, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones are chosen from the group consisting of a POTS phone, a cordless phone, a WIFI TM SIP phone, and a wired SIP phone in that the analog telephone 12b is chosen from this group as it is a POTS phone.

Regarding claim **11**, Forte discloses the limitation that the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (see lines 46-49 of column 13).

Regarding claim **12**, Forte discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (lines 59-61 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (lines 59-61 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has not answered, detecting if the wireless phone has answered (lines 62-63 of column 6).

Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitations that if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones; and if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system. However, Levine discloses the limitations that if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6); and if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8).

Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to terminate all

other calls when one phone answers and to transition to voice mail after a certain delay. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim **14**, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones and the wireless phone use a unified voice mailbox (see lines 64-67 of column 2).

Regarding claim **15**, Forte discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 10 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from line 66 of column 5 through line 10 of column 6 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim **18**, Forte discloses the limitation that the demarcation device wirelessly couples the one or more wired phones to a phone call transport network in lines 23-31 of column 12 which indicate that the link between the PSTN and the PBX can be wireless.

Regarding claim **19**, Forte discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (see step 418 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim **20**, Forte discloses the limitation that the second-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the wireless phone has been answered (see step 414 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim **21**, Forte discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for

Art Unit: 2619

integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 17 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from line 66 of column 5 through line 10 of column 6 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim **23**, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones have been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (lines 59-61 of column 6).

Regarding claim **24**, the combination of Forte and Levine discloses the limitations of parent claim 20 as indicated above. However, Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitation that if the wireless phone has been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones. However, Levine discloses the limitation that if the wireless phone has answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to terminate all other calls when one phone answers. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

Regarding claim **25**, the combination of Forte and Levine discloses the limitations of parent claim 20 as indicated above. However, Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitation

that if neither the one or more wired phones or the wireless phone has been answered, sending the incoming phone call to a unified voice mail system.

However, Levine discloses the limitation that if neither the one or more wired phones or the wireless phone has been answered, sending the incoming phone call to a unified voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8). Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to transition to voice mail after a certain delay. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

15. Claims **5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,162,020 to Forte in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0170268 to Hokusui.

Regarding claim **5**, Forte discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Forte also discloses that one of the advantages of the invention is the ability to provide the features of the PBX network to the remote device (see lines 64-67 of column 2, for example.) Forte does not disclose expressly the limitations of claim 5 that the second communication channel can join the incoming phone call of the first communication channel, and the phone call can be manually transferred from the second Communication channel to the first communication channel. However, it is well known that call

Art Unit: 2619

transfer and conferencing are features of PBX systems. For example, Hokusui discloses this in paragraph 3 on page 1. Forte and Hokusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to *explicitly* include call transfer and conferencing in the features provided in the PBX of Forte and thus extended to the remote device to disclose the limitations of claim 5. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow flexibility generally provided in PBX systems to extend to the remote device as suggested by Forte in lines 61-67 of column 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hokusui with Forte for the benefit of providing PBX features to the remote device to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Forte discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Forte does not disclose expressly the limitation of claim 6 that the interface is one of a wireless cellular interface, a PSTN interface and a VOIP interface. However, Hokusui discloses the limitation that the interface is one of a wireless cellular interface, a PSTN interface and a VOIP interface in the LAN interface to the virtual PBX of Figure 6. Forte and Hokusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the PBX implementation of Forte to include a LAN interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce long distance charges as suggested by Hokusui in paragraph 4 on page 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Hakusui with Forte for the benefit of reducing long distance charges to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, Forte discloses the limitation that the VOIP interface is one of a wireless Internet interface, a WIFI TM interface, a power line Internet interface, an ultra-wide band wireless interface, a microwave internet interface, a cable modem interface, and a direct broadcast Satellite Internet interface in lines 23-31 of column 12 which indicate that the link between the PSTN and the PBX can be wireless. In the above combination, where the PBX is connected to a LAN using VOIP, this interface will be a wireless Internet interface which discloses the limitation that the VOIP interface is a wireless Internet interface.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- U.S. 2002/0172345 to Wu discloses a method of universal communication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL whose telephone number is (571)272-3169. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2619

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert C. Scheibel
Examiner
Art Unit 2619

/R. C. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/Wing F. Chan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619
6/16/08